

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Currently, claims 1-2 and 4-13 are pending in this application.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112:

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The limitation “to be able to distinguish between individual call types” has been deleted from claims 12 and 13. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Objection to the Claims:

Claims 1-3, 5 and 8 were objected to because of an informality. The spelling of the word “centre” has now been changed to --center--. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Takeda. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Takeda was cited as document “D5” in the International Preliminary Examination Report (IPER) for corresponding international application no. PCT/GB99/02492. The IPER states, *inter alia*, “Claim 1 thus meets the requirements of Articles 33(1)-(4) PCT with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability.” The IPER further states “Claim 8 thus meets the

requirements of Articles 33(1)-(4) PCT with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability.”

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, Takeda fails to teach or suggest “(i) notify the enhanced service processing apparatus of that attempt when an occurrence of the predetermined event has been recorded by the event detection means, receiving switching control commands to establish or terminate said call, wherein the switching control commands are sent by the enhanced service processing apparatus in response to the notification, or (ii) establish or terminate said call connection without notifying the enhanced service apparatus when an occurrence of the predetermined event has not been recorded by the event detection means,” as required by independent claim 1. Similarly, Takeda fails to teach or suggest “(i) if it is determined that a record of the occurrence of one or more of said predetermined events exists at the switching center, then notifying an enhanced service processing apparatus of the attempt, generating switching control commands at the enhanced service processing apparatus, and communicating said commands to the switching center to control the establishment or termination of said call; or (ii) if it is determined that no record of the occurrence of one or more of said predetermined events currently exists at the switching center, then establishing or terminating the call using only

the switching functions of the switching center,” as required by independent claim

8. Similar comments apply to independent claims 12 and 13.

The feature of notifying the enhanced service apparatus only if an occurrence of predetermined event has been recorded by the detection means in claim 1 has been clarified. Likewise, the situation when a call is established or terminated without notifying the enhanced service apparatus has also been clarified.

In exemplary non-limiting embodiments of the present invention, two situations take place. The first situation is when a predetermined event is detected, such as, for example, leaving a voice mail (see, e.g., dependent claim 6). The event is recorded as having occurred by the setting of a suitable flag (see, e.g., dependent claim 2). Then, when a subsequent call is made by the called party and that call terminates, the control processor in the switching center notes that the predetermined event has been recorded and notifies the enhanced service processing apparatus. The enhanced service processing apparatus responds by returning switching control commands to the control processor to cause it, for example, to connect the subscriber (called party) to a voice mail center so that the recorded voice mail message can be heard.

However, in a second situation, a call is either established or terminated without notifying the enhanced service apparatus if an occurrence of a predetermined event has not previously been recorded. For example, if no flags

have been set, the call terminates in the above voice mail example in the normal manner without notifying the enhanced service apparatus.

Exemplary embodiments of the present invention provide the advantage that the enhanced service processing apparatus is only notified when it is needed, which is based on the occurrence of predetermined event(s) associated with the subscriber line. Exemplary embodiments of the present invention record occurrences related to a subscriber line and then process calls via the same subscriber line accordingly. This differs substantially to those systems which process calls based on details associated with the call itself (e.g., billing for toll-free numbers).

Takeda fails to teach or suggest the recordal of previously occurring events and using this information to determine how to process subsequent calls.

Furthermore, in Takeda all calls are treated in the same manner by creating a request message (BCSM) corresponding to the call (see column 6, lines 13 to 20). Therefore, calls received in Takeda's system are processed on an ad hoc basis and the manner in which a call is processed is only dependent on the call itself. In contrast, the present invention requires that notification of the enhanced service apparatus only takes place if the occurrence of a predetermined event has been previously recorded. As such, the present invention does not suffer from the problems associated with Takeda and instead, results in simplified switching equipment with reduced communication traffic between elements.

Page 3, lines 5 *et seq.* of the Office Action apparently alleges that col. 4, lines 60-65 of Takeda discloses “the switching center having event detection means for recording the occurrence of a predetermined event associated with the subscriber line.” Applicant respectfully disagrees with this allegation. This portion of Takeda merely indicates that each switching system 3 has the function of distinguishing between those calls (“IN call”) which need to gain access to a service control point (SCP1) and those calls (basic or general calls) which do not require such SCP access inside each switching system 3. Each switching system 3 therefore must distinguish between different call types. Switching system 3 processes calls based on details with the call itself (such as billing for toll-free members) as opposed to whether or not the occurrence of the predetermined event associated with a subscriber line has been previously recorded.

Col. 4, lines 39-50 (also specifically identified by the Office Action) merely indicates services executed by SCP1 which each switching system 3 alone cannot deal with. This passage fails to teach or suggest notifying an enhanced service processing apparatus when occurrence of a predetermined event has been recorded or establishing or determining a call connection without notifying the enhanced service apparatus when the occurrence has not been recorded. The toll-free number service described in col. 4 of Takeda is merely an example of non-basic services executed by SCP1 rather than each switching system 3, these services

PETTIFOR et al.
Application No. 09/743,702
December 27, 2004

being initiated based on details of the current call itself, not a previously recorded occurrence of a predetermined event.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-13 are not “obvious” over Takeda and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that this entire application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a notice to this effect. If the Examiner has any questions or believes that an interview would further prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____



Raymond Y. Mah
Reg. No. 41,426

RYM:sl
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4044
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100